DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 425 JC 880 077

AUTHOR Suchorski, Joan M.
TITLE Contract Training in Community Colleges.
PUB DATE Dec 87
NOTE 32p.; Graduate seminar paper, University of Florida.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Economic Development; Educational Trends; *Job Training; Labor Force Development; *Performance Contracts; Program Administration; *School Business Relationship; Two Year Colleges; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Contract Training; *Santa Fe Community College NM

ABSTRACT

One of the most significant developments in higher education over the past decade has been the increased linkages between colleges and other organizations and institutions. A prominent and fast-growing form of linkage is contract training. Contract training refers to an arrangement in which a business, a government agency, or a community association contracts directly with a college for the provision of instruction to its employees, clients, or its members. Contract training programs can generally be clustered around several areas of activity: apprenticeship training, community-wide collaboration, community-based education, contract services for industry, economic development services, Job Training Partnership Act programs, faculty "return to industry" programs, program development sharing, and specialized programs. This review of community college contract training covers the following topics: (1) organization for delivery and extent of involvement; (2) types of training and current patterns; (3) problems and barriers to the full utilization of community college resources by industry; (4) benefits; (5) trends and predominant models; and (6) elements of successful programs. The next part of the report offers a case study of contract training at Santa Fe Community College (New Mexico), covering the same areas. The final sections examine policy issues, discuss implications for increasing participation, and offer conclusions. An 18-item bibliography is included. (UCM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED291425

# CONTRACT TRAINING IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

By

JOAN M. SUCHORSKI

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J.L. Wattenbarger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A PAPER SUBMITTED TO DR. JAMES L. WATTENBARGER
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR EDA 6053 - THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN AMERICA

DECEMBER 1987

JC 880077

## INTRODUCTION

One of the most significant developments in higher education over the past decade has been the increased linkages between colleges and other organizations and institutions (Deegan and Drisko, 1985). A prominent form of linkage, and one that is perhaps the fastest-growing with the promise of future potential is contract training (Feldman, 1985).

Contract training merits attention for several reasons. The current demand among organizations for training and education is strong. The private sector currently spends approximately $30 billion per year on company-required formal training, and the government expends nearly $5 billion per year on training for those employed there (Carnevale, 1986). The demand for training among business, industry, and government represents a relatively untapped source of potential clientele for colleges.

The demand for training is also predicted to increase. The United States is undergoing a transition from an industrialized economy to an information-age and service-centered society. Workers will need to be trained and retrained as technological advances evolve at the worksite. Demographic influences such as an aging skilled workforce, a shortage of skilled entry-level workers and a continued increase in the percentage of women and minorities that will comprise new workers in the next two decades will also contribute to the demand for training and retraining. (The College Board, 1983).

A third reason contract training merits attention is the increased recognition among businesses that colleges, especially community colleges, may be able to

provide effective training at a far lower cost. Small and even medium size businesses may have difficulty in funding a training department, and even some wealthy firms do not want to or cannot afford to increase their training programs (Jackson, 1982, reported in Deegan and Drisko, 1985). Nonprofit organizations also have similar needs for training with few resources available for staff development.

The focus of this paper is two-fold. The first focus is to examine contract training programs operating nationally within community colleges. What is the extent of the community colleges' current involvement in providing contract training? How are the programs organized for delivery? What types of programs are the colleges providing and to whom? What are some current patterns in contract training and what are some future trends? What are the benefits and the problems associated with contract training programs? What are some characteristics of successful programs? What are some policy issues colleges need to address for successful implementation? What are some implications for increasing participation?

The second focus of this paper is to examine contract training programs operating at one local community college. The case study provides an opportunity to learn how the programs operate on a practical level, and in comparison to the national profile.

## ORGANIZATION FOR DELIVERY AND EXTENT OF INVOLVEMENT

Contract training refers to an arrangement in which a business, a government agency, or a voluntary community association contracts directly with a college

for the provision of instruction to its employees, its clients or to its members (The College Board, 1983).

Community colleges have been at the forefront in providing contract training programs. A study by Deegan and Drisko (1985) found that 69 percent of a representative national sample of American community colleges had established a contract training program as of the spring of 1983.

Deegan and Drisko's study also showed that a large majority (74 percent) of the colleges have some form of centralized organizational structure for the contract training program. The contract training programs are most commonly managed within the continuing education/community services division of the college (50 percent). Nineteen percent of the responding colleges centrally manage their program through the office of an academic dean and 14 percent of the colleges operate from the occupational/vocational office.

Decentralized contract training program management was reported by 26 percent of these respondents in the same study. The individuals most frequently identified as having primary responsibility for program management were the academic deans (32 percent) and division directors (31 percent). Shared responsibility for management was reported by 26 percent of the respondents.

Deegan and Drisko (1985) also researched the extent of the colleges' involvement in contract training programs. Their data indicate that many colleges (47.3 percent in 1980-81 and 37.7 percent in 1981-82) have only very small programs of one to five contracts annually. However, many of these programs are new. The researchers report that a significant number of the 28 additional

respondents for 1981-82 had no programs in 1980-81. For those with medium to large programs, the data showed considerable quantitative growth. In 1980-81, 34.4 percent of the responding colleges had programs with 11 or more contracts annually; this grew to 42.6 percent in 1981-82. Those colleges reporting more than 20 annual contracts rose from 17.2 percent in 1980-81 to 27.8 percent in 1981-82.

## TYPES OF TRAINING AND CURRENT PATTERNS

Contract training programs can generally be clustered around several areas of activity: apprenticeship training; community-wide collaboration; community-based education; contract services for industry; economic development services; CETA (now JTPA) programs; faculty "return-to-industry" programs; program development sharing; and "specialized" programs. The clients for contract training programs in community colleges, according to Deegan and Drisko's study (1985), are: business and industry (69 percent), health care organizations (13.7 percent), government agencies (13.2 percent), and "others" which include labor unions, service agencies and CETA (Comprehensive Employment and Training Act) private industry councils (4.2 percent).

Successful models of contract training are widely reported and are as diverse as the businesses and organizations involved. General Motors Corporation, for example, has contracts with about 45 Community Colleges nationwide to train service technicians for its automobile dealers across the country (Watkins, 1982). A consortium of telecommunications companies in the San Francisco area, in conjunction with the community college, are developing a program to train about 200 telecommunications technicians yearly to fill jobs with local

companies (Watkins, 1982; Duscha, 1984). Thirty-five of the 58 colleges in the North Carolina Community College system currently operate small business centers. Activities include providing a specially trained workforce for new, expanding or for traditional industries, and providing training assistance to small businesses throughout the state. Current plans call for an expansion of the small business centers to all 58 of the state's community colleges (Holdsworth, 1984; Overton, 1986).

A review of the literature revealed program areas such as apprenticeship training, as widely contracted, and includes training for occupations such as tool and die, electrician, machine repair, pipefitter, millwright and machinist. Programs have also been contracted in other diverse areas such as child abuse prevention, management and supervisory training, computer operation, and personal development areas such as wellness, pre-retirement planning, and stress and time management. A sampling of the industries represented include lumbering, fishing, hi-tech, agriculture, tourism and a multiplicity of others (AACJC, 1982; the College Board, 1983).

The College Board (1983, p. IX-X) has identified some predominant "patterns" in contract training.

1. The institutions providing contract training are as diverse and dissimilar as the types of training offered.

2. The organizations that contract are large enough to supply a class of students and pay for their tuition.

3. Contracts for single courses are more common than contracts for degrees.

4. Courses that offer occupational enhancement, skill training and retraining are more sought after than those that do not.

5. The duration of courses varies widely and is determined by what needs to be learned rather than what could be taught in a standard semester course.

6. The instructional methods used are diverse and most often confront learners with lifelike problems and assistance in developing solutions.

7. The vast majority of instructors are members of the college faculty.

8. Training most often occurs at the client's site.

9. Organizations generally recruit and select the employees who will receive the training, give them full pay throughout the training period, and provide facilities and administrative assistance.

10. Colleges generally offer the full-range of services as those offered to the traditional student.

11. The most common pattern of certification has been standard, academic-credit hours reflecting the amount of instructional hours involved.

(The College board, 1983). On this point, Deegan and Drisko's (1985) study showed noncredit programming to be the predominant pattern.

## PROBLEMS AND BARRIERS

Employee-sponsored training and education has experienced a surge of growth in recent years; witness the $30-$40 billion spent annually to train and retrain workers on the job. However, only 18.6 percent of that training was provided by two-year colleges or technical institutes (Carnevale, 1986). A second research study conducted in the southwestern part of the United States reported only 1.9 percent of the total corporate training budget was spent in training provided by community colleges (Moser, 1981, reported in Moser 1986). Why has industry been reluctant to more fully utilize resources available through community colleges? And what problems do colleges have in implementing contract training programs?

From industry's point of view, the growth of employee-sponsored training is a "product of the inadequacies, inaccuracies, and overall qualitative deficiencies in public sector education" (Levine and Doyle, 1982, reported in Feldman, 1985). Businesses feel colleges are ill-equipped to train workers in state-of-the-art technology, and that colleges focus more on self-enrichment than on direct productivity issues. (Watkins, 1982; Moser, 1986).

Businesses perceive educators as having little interest in working with business because it requires a new approach and extra effort (Jasso, 1984). Businesses also find it difficult to work with colleges because they perceive educators as lacking concern or understanding of business needs; lacking

flexibility, requiring too much red tape; and having unbusinesslike standards (Jasso, 1984). A poor track record may also contribute to business' unwillingness to work with colleges (Moser, 1986).

Implementation of contract programs does pose problems for colleges. Lack of qualified instructors was by far the most significant problem reported by Deegan and Drisko's (1985) study. Colleges cited both the difficulty of locating qualified instructors and of maintaining an on-going relationship. Other problems reported include low internal support by reluctant faculty for the college's contract training effort; difficulties in scheduling contract courses around employee shifts; the longer time required for faculty to agree upon an appropriate program vis-a-vis the client's "need to have it tomorrow"; inadequate campus facilities for some specialized training and the unavailability of the client's facilities for the periods of time necessary; and the lack of suitable strategies for marketing the contract training program (Deegan and Drisko, 1985).

Faculty union contracts may contribute to some of these problems. Faculty contracts oftentimes include clauses which regulate faculty assignments by seniority, by hours and by time span, regulate the hiring of part-time and temporary employees and set specific salary rates (McAnnch and Bevelacqua, 1984). These contractual obstacles may make it difficult for a college to find faculty members to teach a course needed by industry. They may also limit the college's ability to respond to the flexible scheduling needs of business. Furthermore, many faculty contracts also regulate a lengthy process and requirements for curriculum development, thus increasing the shorter "turn-around-time" business instead prefers.

## BENEFITS

Deegan and Drisko's (1985) study also includes data and information on the benefits to colleges from participating in contract training. Improved relationships with businesses yielding subsequent benefits such as donations of equipment to the college, increased opportunities for job placement, improved curriculum, and identification of potential part-time faculty were cited most frequently.

According to their study, contract training also generates "increased revenues to the college in times of enrollment stabilization and decreased public funding; the opportunity to fulfill the college's mission by meeting the training needs of the business community; increased visibility resulting in greater community support and increased enrollments in regular courses; the opportunity to provide "real world" contact for the college faculty involved in preparing students for careers in business and industry; and beneficial public relations through increased media coverage" (p. 16).

The ideal partnership is characterized by a "win-win" situation; both parties mutually benefit. Feldman (1985) writes that "colleges can learn from corporations about teaching and corporations can learn from colleges about technology and even management. The corporate world, for example, is far ahead of most colleges in the use of sophisticated systems of self-instruction" (p.91). According to the Conference Board, colleges "would do well to emulate industry in its growing emphasis on student participation--the blending of classroom study with both programmed self-study and planned problem-solving experience, the tailoring of curricula to clearly defined goals and individual needs, and

the employment of advanced instructional technologies" (Lusterman, 1977, p. 66). Contract training provides these opportunities.

## TRENDS

According to Deegan and Drisko (1985), the most significant trend in contract training is toward training that is specially tailored to meet the needs of the specific client. The survey respondents described the training as narrowly focused, intensive and of short duration. Other major trends include a marked increase in the number of contracts between colleges and other organizations; an increase in training in new technological areas; a growing realization of the need for employee retraining by employers; and further increases in training provided at client job sites. The reasons the survey respondents predicted an increase in the importance of contract training programs were 1) the belief that increased efforts are resulting in increase contracts; 2) the realization by many organizations of the need for training and the cost effectiveness of community college programs; and 3) changing economic conditions (Deegan and Drisko, 1985).

A centralized form of contract training management may also continue to grow in predominance. As reported earlier, 74 percent of the colleges doing contract training currently manage it through a centralized organization; most commonly this is through the continuing education/community services office (Deegan and Drisko, 1985). The Association of Community Colleges is urging all colleges to establish business-industry councils in their own communities to provide the training employees need (Watkins, 1982); this may further encourage the

transition from decentralized to centralized management, and encourage evolvement toward a different model of management.

The two predominant models for organizing contract training programs are the community services integrated model and the business institute model (Deegan and Drisko, 1985). The community services integrated model has all contract programs housed within the community services division of the college. Strengths of this model include effective communication and coordination with other community service efforts. One significant problem however, is the lack of a strong visible image and the absence of significant staff and other resources needed to build the contract training program. Existing staff may have to juggle part-time efforts in several areas of responsibility. Strong organizational support through a certain amount of "risk capital" is absent.

The business-institute model is the second approach Deegan and Drisko describe. It may be a separate organizational unit or it may be housed within the community services division. A major strength of this model is the enhanced image and identity of the unit that can be promoted as a special approach to contract training. This model is likely to include a separate director and support staff. Strong organizational support is evidenced through the "risk capital" investment required for implementation . Extra coordination and communication efforts may, however, be required with this approach.

## ELEMENTS OF SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS

Both industry and education benefit from collaborative contract training efforts. Industry acquires cost effective training to meet changing tech-

nological needs, to train new employees and retrain present workers. Benefits to education include updated instructional programs, instructors who are kept current on state-of-the-art practices and financial and other resource support.

Some common elements of successful programs in colleges that have contract training programs have been identified to help other colleges implement new programs in this emerging delivery system, or to help them expand their existing efforts. Warmbrod et.al. (1981, p. 117-118) suggest the following guidelines for mutual educational and financial benefits.

1. Clear communication between key persons in industry and education is essential.

2. The programs offered and the teaching must be of the highest quality. Content and methods must be specifically tailored to the needs of the client.

3. There must be institutional flexibility in scheduling courses, assigning faculty and in selecting instructional methods. Program times, length and location must be consistent with user hours and needs.

4. An effective advisory council should be developed and used.

5. Education should have a quick response time in meeting industry needs. The AACJC (1982) cautions however to promise only what you can deliver in quality fashion.

6. The full support of college administrators and faculty is needed to successfully serve the contract training efforts.

7. There should be continued evaluation of the program content, methods and management.

8. Careful planning in all efforts is essential.

## CASE STUDY: CONTRACT TRAINING AT SANTA FE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Personal interviews were conducted with the following personnel at Santa Fe Community College (SFCC):

1. Dr. W. Jack Fuller, Dean for Vocational Education;
2. Dr. Tony Blalock, Director, Public Service/ Technical Education;
3. Thomas O'Neal, Director, Industrial Education; and
4. Dr. Harlan Trofholz, Director, Business Programs.

Additional information was obtained from Louis Kalivoda, Director, Institute of Government.

The objectives of the interviews are listed below.

1. To determine the approximate level and extent of current contract training efforts at SFCC;

2. To determine the types of training being provided and to whom;

3. To determine some predominant characteristics of the contract training programs;

4. To determine the perceived benefits and problems related to contract training;

5. To glean a sense of likely future trends and planned direction.

A. Organization for Delivery and Extent of Involvement

Contract training at Santa Fe Community College (SFCC) occurs widely throughout the college in a functionally decentralized fashion. Some level of contract training occurs within the Departments of Business Programs, Industrial Education, Public Service/Technical Education and in Health Related Programs, all of which are part of the Division of Vocational Education, and through the Institute of Government, which is under the direction of the President's Office. The College also provides contract training through the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) under the direction of the Women's Programs in Student Development. Generally, the contracts are channeled through the Office of Development, through either its Grants and Projects department or through the Endowment Corporation.

The extent of SFCC's involvement in providing contract training programs can be characterized as a medium size program, and growing. The approximate number of current and recent contracts (within the past one year) lies in the range of 24 to 30 contracts annually. This does not include the numerous non-contractual, short workshops and special seminars which are offered regularly, and which are directed to spacial targeted audiences.

B. Types of Training

The types of training being conducted through contracts are as diverse as the departments involved. Training programs have been contracted in areas such as

management/supervisory training, customer relations, office systems technology, human relations, remedial and basic math, computer electronics technology, police and fire technical skills and safety training, blueprint reading, quality control, automotive technician training, welding, building construction, heating and refrigeration, and in surgical techniques. The College also has had several international contracts which involved providing the technical training in Spanish, as well as providing training and instruction in English-as-a-second-language, and an orientation to the American culture.

The clients for these programs include the general City and County governments as well as multiple departments contained within (i.e., housing, police, fire), several hospitals, the University of Florida, and major private sector employers including Gates, Drilltech, Metal Container Corporation, Martin Marietta, and General Motors Corporation. An individual client may have several separate or joint contracts among the different divisions.

C. Characteristics of the Contract Training Programs

The predominant "patterns" which characterize the SFCC contract training programs are generally consistent with the patterns identified by The College Board (1983, p. ix-x), identified earlier. Some of the major patterns are highlighted within the context of the SFCC program.

1. Subject matter. The subject matter is diverse, and in only one case has a degree program for a client been contracted. The prevailing pattern is that contracts for single course are far more common than contracts for

degrees, and courses that offer occupational enhancement are more sought after than those that do not.

2. Length of training. The duration of the courses has varied widely from one day, to one week, to several months, to two years for a degree. In one case, 8 hours of training per month is provided on an ongoing, open-ended basis. The prevailing pattern is that the length of the training is determined by what needs to be learned, rather than what could be taught in a standard semester course.

3. Instructors. All kinds of teachers have been used to implement the programs, from full-time college faculty, to part-time or adjunct faculty, (or a mixture of both), to outside consultants. Gainesville is characterized as a "personnel rich" community; thus the programs use whatever combination of faculty is necessary to get the job done and to meet the client's "experience-rich" needs. The seemingly prevailing pattern is to use existing full-time college faculty first, supplemented by part-time faculty or consultants as needed.

4. Location. Training programs are held on either the campus or at the client's location, but rarely at both locations. The prevailing pattern is that training most often occurs at the client's site.

5. Certification. Every conceivable kind of certification is used, from academic credits, to the academic degrees, to occupational certification, to Continuing Education Units, to documentation of satisfactory completion or performance. Unlike the pattern identified by The College Board

(1983), the dominant pattern at SFCC appears to be noncredit programming; the dominance of noncredit programming is consistent with the findings of Deegan and Drisko (1985).

As is true of the national profile, the "model" which best describes SFCC's contract training is the "model" which best meets the employers' needs.

According to those interviewed, contract programs at SFCC have been successful, and as evidenced through routine student and client evaluations. The ultimate measure of success, according to one person, "is whether or not they contract with you again."

Success of the programs lies partially in the individuals' abilities to be flexible and to provide a quick response time. Those interviewed indicated a strong desire and willingness to work with the private sector and with governmental agencies. The strength of the faculty also contributes substantially to the overall program quality and success.

Generally, contract training programs are viewed as a cost- effective training option for the client; that does not necessarily make them inexpensive. The cost of securing a highly qualified professional on a full-time, short-term basis, for example, is high. The programs are contracted on a cost-plus basis which generally affords the college the ability to provide whatever the client needs.

D. Problems

One common problem among those interviewed is the time required to develop a contract training course. The clients' need for a quick response time vis-a-vis the time required to develop the curriculum, arrange for instruction, and coordinate the other elements of the total program often times creates stress for existing management and faculty. All those who were interviewed, however, indicated that their flexibility and their ability to provide a quick "turn-around-time" were major elements of their program's success.

There are also some problems associated with faculty. Full-time faculty "burn-out" because of an extra load is one problem that was cited; related to this is the lack of full support by faculty toward the contract training effort. Possible neglect of regular classes by full-time faculty was also mentioned as a potential problem area.

Restrictions in the provision of supplemental pay at the lower part-time faculty rate to full-time faculty was also cited as a problem, though not unworkable. The use of full-time faculty becomes a major problem only when alternate arrangements for supplemental pay at a rate equal to or greater than their current base salary cannot be made.

"Red tape" associated with providing academic courses, specifically regarding residency and grading requirements, was another problem area discussed. Noncredit programs are easier to implement, and are less restrictive; this likely contributes to the growing trend in that direction.

Some other problems mentioned include difficulty in scheduling courses around the client's rotating employee shifts, the need for tight quality control when using consultants, and a perceived lack of full institutional support for increased contract training efforts.

E. Benefits

According to those interviewed, the benefits of contract training far outweigh the problems associated with its implementation.

A major benefit cited by all those who were interviewed is the benefit accorded to faculty. Faculty morale is positively influenced by the increased supplemental income the contract courses generate. The contract courses also provide additional diversity and a change in routine within their normal workday, and provide valuable experiences in "real world" work environments. Faculty training in state-of-the-art technology (most notably through the General Motors Program) is also a major benefit associated with contract programs.

Contract training programs also provide benefits in the area of curriculum development. Curriculum stays current and up-to-date, and in some cases, the clients provide the curriculum which can then be used in other courses outside those contracted.

Increased revenue to the College was a third major benefit cited. The programs generate profits which in turn provide direct benefits to the individual departments and to the College as a whole. The donation of new equipment to the College by the client is also a related benefit.

Increased enrollments in "regular" courses is also a perceived benefit of contract training. Participants in the contract programs often indicate on the evaluation forms their intent to take additional coursework at SFCC.

Positive community relationships were a final area of benefit cited. Relationships with clients are improved, and relationships with the community in general are enhanced through the use of consultants.

F. Future Trends

Growth and expansion best summarizes the perceived future trend and direction of contract training programs at SFCC. In at least one department, a concrete goal to increase contract training by 60 percent over the next five years has been established; whereas contract programs now represent approximately 25 percent of that division's total budget, the goal is to increase the programs to a level representing 40 percent of the division's total operating budget.

Growth will occur because the need is present. Technology is invading every aspect of our daily functions on the job. Skill upgrading and retraining will be a "given" part of our future. Interestingly, concurrent with the increased demand for training in the "hi-tech" area is the increased demand for training in the human relations and people skills arenas. As one interviewer described it, "those who are trained in high technology must also be trained to effectively implement the technology through other workers on the job; ". . . they must be able to function as employee change agents." Inevitably, human relations training is usually included as a component of the "hi-tech" contract courses.

Growth is a clear probable future direction; less clear is the direction of the organizational structure for management and delivery. Functionally, the contract training programs at SFCC are currently highly decentralized; seemingly, uniform agreement is absent on whether or not it should remain this way or if centralization might better serve the needs of the community and of the college.

There are some distinct advantages and disadvantages to both organizational structures. Some strengths of the decentralized approach, according to those interviewed, include the reduced costs associated with less overhead; a centralized approach would not be as profitable unless it was organized as a major activity, and it is not certain that the SFCC market with its limited client base of large employers could sustain the effort.

On the other hand, others argue that growth of contract training as a major activity is more likely to occur with centralization than with decentralization. Centralization would provide the college with an enhanced image as a separate unit identity with a special approach to meeting the training needs of the community's employers. Potential clients may be less likely to "fall-through-the-cracks" because a central contract at the college is established; marketing would necessarily take on a higher profile. Centralization may also reduce some of the time stresses on existing management, but at a cost. Cost and the uncertainty of a local market large enough to sustain a concentrated effort are the two largest and most obvious disadvantages of a centralized form of management.

There is concurrence that contract programs at SFCC will likely grow in importance and in influence within the coming years. Caution that balance be maintained was expressed by one person interviewed; we must "not begin to rely too heavily on contract programs lest our regular programs suffer." Consistent quality must be maintained in all our programs, and especially within contract courses. One person compared contract training to a marriage; "it can work well or not, however too many divorces will ruin [the contract program efforts]."

Increased growth may also have implications for new types of negotiations and governance. As the client's influence increases, so too does the potential for increased control. Some evidence of this is already apparent in a few programs. The college must keep the larger mission in perspective.

## POLICY ISSUES

Contract training programs appear to be emerging as a major force and influence at a large number of community colleges across the country. A dominant issue is the need for community college leaders to develop policies and plans to guide the collaborative relationship, as they develop in the coming years. Feldman (1985) warns of "a danger of an ad hoc and piecemeal drift into relationships, especially those with business and industry, which may not be in the long-term best interests of the college, (p. 17). Community colleges must not become simply a supplier of educational devices defined by others. He cautions colleges not to "devise or offer programs that are unworthy, that do not first of all serve the student, or that are in any way unbalanced" (p. 190).

Deegan and Drisko (1985) suggest the following policy questions to guide colleges in the development or expansion of contract training programs. They recommend that colleges use these questions and issues as a focus for analysis in order to place contract programs within the broader institutional context.

- What will be the place and priority of contract training programs in the mission of the college?

- What impact will the programs have on institutional values? On reward systems?

- Should contract programs be organized as a separate unit or integrated within an existing unit? If organized as a separate unit, how can program quality and integrity be monitored?

- What will be the relationship of contract efforts to the rest of the college? What role will full time faculty play in guiding or participating in these efforts?

- Will the college provide sufficient risk capital to allow staff to do the kinds of needs assessment, planning and marketing to fully implement a contract program?

- What will be the college's policy on profits and on distribution of profits?

- How will staff and program evaluation be conducted? What role will contracting agencies play in these evaluations?

- How can the college assure that staff hired as contract instructors will be effective representatives of the college?

Deegan, Tillery and Melone (1985) suggest that colleges consider some additional issues to help them assess the cost and benefits of these contract linkages, and to help them assess their impact on the fundamental values and mission of community colleges.

- How do contract training programs influence educational policies and programs? What is their impact on staff? On finance?

- Where is the locus of control for decision making about these programs: Do corporations specify programs, do community colleges offer choices, or are programs negotiated? What is the faculty role in these decisions?

- What conditions lead to successful contract training programs? What conditions lead to problems? By what criteria are programs judged successful?

- What impact are contract training programs having on state education policies? What public monies are provided, in what form, and for what activities?

- What benefits accrue from increased linkages and contracts with businesses? Do staff exchanges, equipment sharing, or other benefits for the college result from contracts?

- What are the likely future issues in contract training, and how might they affect the fundamental values and missions of community colleges?

## IMPLICATIONS FOR INCREASING PARTICIPATION

Contract training programs are one avenue that holds the promise of potential for meeting the changing needs of the adult learner in our changing society.

Adults will need to learn and relearn on the job and will need to generally expect to be engaged in lifelong learning experiences.

One important implication of contract training programs is the increased probability it may provide for participation in subsequent formal learning activities. Prior educational attainment is a primary indicator of participation in adult education (Cross, 1981). As workers participate in successful contract training program experiences, they may become predisposed to pursuing additional formal education and training. This probability may also be enhanced by the concomitant positive peer group influence of the adult's co-workers; the values and influence exerted by important reference groups--co-workers--also affects participation in adult education (Cross, 1981). Follow-up on subsequent enrollment in "regular" courses resultant from participation in contract training programs is needed to test the validity of this line of thinking.

Contract programs may also have important implications for increasing minority participation in adult education. The types of programs currently offered are diverse and cover all skill levels, including entry level. Contract programs also include providing training to government-sponsored employment programs which often target minorities. As minority participation in the labor market increases, and as contract programs increase and expand, so too will the opportunities for minority participation.

## CONCLUSION

Contract training programs are emerging as a major influence within community colleges. As fiscal resources diminish and as competition for students increase, some colleges may indeed choose to more strongly develop these and other horizontal linkages with business. Each college will need to examine their own strengths and the markets available to them to successfully meet the challenges of the Community College's fifth generation (Cross, 1985). For many colleges, contract training programs will provide the avenue to a more viable and successful future.

These linkages must not occur haphazardly however, but rather in a planned and visionary fashion. Quality must remain at the forefront of importance, along with the larger mission of serving students' needs at their point of entry.

A perspective by Deegan (et al., 1985) perhaps best summarizes the challenges of contract programs. They write . . . "At their best, contract training programs may be a natural part of the community service and continuing education functions. At their worst these programs can distort the educational mission to one of providing low-cost training, which may not be in the best interest of the college or the taxpayers. There is a need to step back from these linkages with businesses and to assess their impact on the fundamental values and mission of community colleges" (p. 319). The challenges are ours.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (1982). Community College Centers For Contracted Programs: A Sequel to Shoulders To The Wheel. Washington: AACJC.

Carnevale, A.P. (1986). The Learning Enterprise. Training and Development Journal, January 1986: 18-26.

The College Board. (1983). Training By Contract: College-Employer Profiles. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Cross, K.P. (1985). Determining Missions and Priorities for the Fifth Generation. In W.L. Deegan and D.J. Tillery (Eds.), Renewing the American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cross, K.P. (1981). Adults As Learners. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Deegan, W.L. and Drisko, R. (1985). Contract Training in Community Colleges: Progress and Policy Issues. Community and Junior College Journal, 55(6): 14-17.

Deegan, W.L., Tillery, D. and Melone, R.J. (1985). The Process for Renewal: An Agenda for Action. In W.L. Deegan and D. J. Tillery (Eds.), Renewing the American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Duscha, S. (1984). Retooling For Productivity. Community and Junior College Journal, 55(3): 40-42.

Feldman, M.J. (1985). Establishing Linkages With Other Educational Providers. In W.L. Deegan and D.J. Tillery (Eds.), Renewing The American Community College, (pp.175-195). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Holdsworth, R.W. (1984). No Shrinking Violet. Community and Junior College Journal, 55(3): 24-26.

Jasso, G. (1984). Why Businesses Find It Hard To Work With Schools. In American Vocational Association (1984 Yearbook), Collaboration: Vocational Education And The Private Sector (pp. 81-87). Arlington, VA. American Vocational Association.

Korim, A.S. Challenges Facing Community Colleges In The 1980s. In K.F. Arns (Ed.), New Directions For Community Colleges, No. 33. Occupational Education Today (pp.11-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lusterman, S. (1977). Education In Industry. New York: The Conference Board.

McAnnch, H. and Bevelacqua (1984). How Employer-Employee Contracts affect Collaboration: The View From Education. In American Vocational Association (1984 Yearbook), Collaboration: Vocational Education And The Private Sector (pp.105-112). Arlington, VA: American Vocational Association.

Moser, K. (1986). Business-Industry Linkages With Post-Secondary Institutions: Implications For Building Successful Partnerships. Journal Of Lifelong Learning, 9(7): 4-5; 27-28.

Overton, R.J. (1986). North Carolina Community College System Small Business Centers: Progress Report III. North Carolina: Department of Community Colleges.

Warmbrod, C.P.; Persavich, J.J. and L'angelle, D. (1981). Models Of Post-secondary Occupational Education And Industry Cooperation For Educational And Financial Benefits. Columbus: Ohio State University.

Watkins, B.T. (1982). Community Colleges And Industry Ally To Provide "Customized" Job Training. The Chronicle Of Higher Education, October 27, 1982 p. 4.



ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges APR 01 1988